



IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

Re: Decisions of the Director of Group 210
Petitioner: Ole K. Nilssen

FEB 22 1991

RECEIVED

PETITION RE IMPROPER RETURN OF PRIOR PETITION

MAR 27 1991

I, OLE K. NILSEN, HEREWITHE
CERTIFY THAT THE DATE OF
DEPOSIT WITH THE U.S. POSTAL
SERVICE OF THIS PAPER OR FEE

Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks DEPUTY ASST. COMM. IS: 2-21-91
Washington, D.C. 20231 181

Petitioner herewith petitions Commissioner, under paragraph 37 CFR 1.181a, to review the actions of the Director for Group 210 with respect to: (i) his decision with respect to Applicant's PETITION RE IMPROPER FINAL REJECTION, which was submitted 10/28/90; and (ii) his return of Applicant's REPEATED PETITION RE IMPROPER RESPONSE TO PREVIOUS PETITION, which was submitted on 01/13/91.

In the Petitioner's view, the Director's responses to the above- identified petitions were utterly improper; and the Petitioner requests of the Commissioner to rectify those decisions.

Attached hereto, in reverse chronological order, are copies of all the pertinent documents related to instant situation:

1. DECISION ON PETITION, dated 15 FEB 1991;
(This "DECISION" was in fact no decision)
2. REPEATED PETITION RE IMPROPER RESPONSE TO PREVIOUS PETITION, dated JAN 16, 1991;
3. PETITION RE IMPROPER RESPONSE TO PREVIOUS PETITION, dated NOV 23, 1990.
4. Paper No. 78, dated 16 NOV 1990;
5. PETITION RE IMPROPER FINAL REJECTION, dated NOV 1, 1990;

The Director's reason for returning Petitioner's most recent petition relates to an alleged lack of courtesy on part of Petitioner in dealing with Patent Office personnel; which alleged lack of courtesy involves Petitioner's delineation (at page 2 of his PETITION RE IMPROPER FINAL REJECTION) of his reasons for requesting the removal of a certain examiner from the prosecution of one of Petitioner's pending patent applications.

In the Petitioner's viewpoint, the Patent Office -- just like any other well run business or other organization -- should be more than glad to hear comments from one of its "customers" with respect to the performance of one of its employees, whether those comments reflect good performance or bad performance.

Of course, when occasionally the Petitioner comments favorably with respect to the performance of an examiner, no further action results.

However, when occasionally the Petitioner comments unfavorably with respect to the performance of an examiner, the Office seems to get up in arms, at least as reflected by the Group 210 Director's reaction to the Petitioner's comments with respect to one of the examiners in his Group.

Is it Office policy that it does not wish to hear any sort of criticism with respect to its performance?

Is it Office policy to classify criticism of an examiner as constituting lack of "decorum" and therefore as being unacceptable?



Ole K. Nilssen, Pro Se Petitioner



UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
Patent and Trademark Office
ASSISTANT SECRETARY AND COMMISSIONER
OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231

Group 210
Art Unit 212
dli

Paper No. 82

In re application of

Ole K. Nilssen :
Serial Number: 06/787,692 :
Filed: October 15, 1985 : DECISION ON PETITION
For: INVERTER WITH RESONANT
L-C CIRCUIT :
:

Returned herewith is Petitioner's communication dated January 16, 1991. This petition is being returned. By enclosing a paper that was previously returned as unacceptable under 37 CFR 1.3, (petition filed November 1, 1990), Petitioner is attempting to enter into the record indirectly that which the Office would not permit to be entered directly.

Under no circumstances will Petitioner be permitted to add to the record of the above-identified application any material deemed unacceptable under 35 CFR 1.3.

Petition is RETURNED.

Donald G. Kelly
Donald G. Kelly, Director
Patent Examining Group 210
Industrial Electronics,
Physics and Related Elements

Ole K. Nilssen
Caesar Drive, RR-5
Barrington, Illinois 60010